

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 JENNIFER TOM,
9 Plaintiff,
10 v.
11 ANDREW SAUL,
12 Defendant.

Case No. 19-cv-06322-JST (RMI)

ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 89

14 Recently, Defendant and Plaintiff arrived at an agreement wherein Defendant agreed to
15 produce certain records (“Web TA” documents) by noting that “[t]he Agency has since confirmed
16 that it is amenable to providing all of plaintiff’s Web TA records (relevant or not) and expects to
17 be able to produce them shortly.” *See* Def.’s Resp. (dkt. 78) at 2. Plaintiff, however, has
18 nevertheless filed a somewhat voluminous motion to compel the production of those materials
19 because of her understanding that a looming discovery cut-off date would operate to absolve
20 Defendant of its obligation to produce those materials. *See* Pl.’s Mot. (dkt. 89) at 1-20. Plaintiff is
21 mistaken. The discovery cut-off date is only intended to foreclose new discovery requests that
22 might be tendered after the cut-off date; however, the cut-off date will have no effect on
23 Defendant’s obligation to produce materials that it has already committed to producing.

24 The court realizes that Plaintiff is a non-attorney that is proceeding *pro se*, and while this
25 entitles Plaintiff to some latitude when it comes to the enforcement of the court’s rules and orders;
26 it does not, however, completely absolve Plaintiff of her responsibility to at least attempt to
27 familiarize herself with the rules and orders of the court and to make a good faith effort to comply
28 with those rules and orders. In the present context, Plaintiff is reminded that she cannot simply

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1 lodge motions to compel discovery at will. Instead, she must first meet and confer with counsel for
2 Defendant in an effort to resolve the discovery dispute without court intervention if at all possible.
3 Court intervention should be solicited in the course of discovery disputes as a last resort, not as a
4 first resort. Following a good faith effort to resolve a discovery dispute without court intervention,
5 if the Parties still find themselves at an impasse, the Parties (including *pro se* parties) are required
6 to follow the rules and orders of this court in the manner in which their discovery disputes are
7 presented. Accordingly, Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to read and familiarize herself with the relevant
8 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure (Rule 37), with Local Civil Rule 37-1¹, and with ¶13 of the
9 undersigned's General Standing Order² wherein the process for presenting discovery disputes by
10 way of a jointly-filed letter brief is set forth. Accordingly, because Plaintiff's Motion to Compel
11 (dkt. 89) appears to have been filed both improperly and prematurely – and perhaps even
12 unnecessarily (in light of Defendant's already-stated commitment to producing this material) – the
13 Motion (dkt. 89) is **DENIED**.

14 A copy of this order will be mailed to Plaintiff using the Court's pandemic-specific
15 mailing protocols, which are attended with some measure of delay; accordingly, counsel for
16 Defendant is **DIRECTED** to promptly serve this Order on Plaintiff via electronic mail pursuant to
17 the Parties' agreement to that effect (*see* dkt. 88).

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19 Dated: April 15, 2021

20 
21 ROBERT M. ILLMAN
22 United States Magistrate Judge
23
24

25 ¹ Local Civil Rule 37-1 begins with the following statement: "The Court will not entertain a request or a
26 motion to resolve a disclosure or discovery dispute unless, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 37, counsel have
27 previously conferred for the purpose of attempting to resolve all disputed issues." The Local Civil Rules of
this Court may be found at:
<https://www.cand.uscourts.gov/rules/civil-local-rules/>

28 ² The undersigned's General Standing Order is available on the Court's website at:
<https://www.cand.uscourts.gov/wp-content/uploads/judges/illman-rmi/RMI-Standing-Order.pdf>